

REMARKS

The Office Action dated February 2, 2004, has been received and carefully reviewed. As a result of that Office Action, claims 1 and 2 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Harder and claim 1 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Nemes. By the above amendment, claim 1 has been amended, claim 2 has been canceled, and claims 3-21 have been added to better define the subject invention. Reconsideration and allowance of claim 1 and examination and allowance of claims 3-21 is respectfully requested.

Claim 1 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Harder. Harder shows a method of adding an oxygen scavenger to a boiler system wherein the addition point is the steam header. Claim 1 requires the addition of a corrosion inhibitor to a steam line rather than to a steam header. For this reason, it is respectfully submitted that Harder does not anticipate claim 1.

Claim 1 also stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Nemes. Nemes discloses the addition of an oxygen scavenger to the condensate line of a boiler system. Claim 1, as amended, requires the addition of a corrosion inhibitor to a steam line rather than to a condensate line.

Because this limitation is not disclosed by Nemes, claim 1 is submitted to be allowable over Nemes.

New claims 3-21 have been added by the above amendment. Claim 3 requires a method of inhibiting corrosion that includes the steps of providing a chemical feeder containing a film-type corrosion inhibitor, connecting the chemical feeder to the steam line or the condensate line, and feeding the film-type corrosion inhibitor directly into the steam line or the condensate line. Feeding a film-type corrosion inhibitor into a boiler can cause certain problems discussed in the specification. These problems are avoided by feeding the film-type corrosion inhibitor directly into the steam line or the condensate line. Neither Harder nor Nemes discloses the addition of a film-type corrosion inhibitor directly into the steam line or condensate line and therefore claim 3 is submitted to patentably distinguish over these references.

Claims 4-6 depend from claim 3 and are therefore submitted to be allowable for the same reasons as claim 3. In addition, claim 4 requires that the film-type corrosion inhibitor be fed into an upstream end of a steam line. This advantageously provides protection for a major portion of the steam line without adversely affecting the boiler.

This feature of the invention is not shown by the prior art, and claim 4 is submitted to be allowable over the prior art for this reason as well.

Claim 5 requires the additional step of feeding the corrosion inhibitor directly into the steam line or condensate line based on an amount of evaporation in the boiler. This avoids the problem of overdosing the boiler system with more corrosion inhibitor than is needed. This aspect of the invention is not shown by the prior art, and claim 5 is submitted to be allowable for this additional reason as well.

Claim 6 requires that, in addition to the feeding of a film-type corrosion inhibitor, 2- amino-2- methyl-1- propanol also be fed by the chemical feeder. This aspect of the invention is not taught by the prior art, and claim 6 is submitted to further distinguish over the prior art for this reason.

Claim 7 requires a method of inhibiting corrosion in a boiler system that includes the steps of providing a chemical feeder containing a film-type corrosion inhibitor, connecting the chemical feeder to the steam header, and feeding the film-type corrosion inhibitor directly into the steam header.

The prior art does not show or suggest the feeding of a film-type corrosion inhibitor directly into a steam header as required by claim 7, and claim 7 is submitted to patentably distinguish over the prior art for this reason.

Claims 8 and 9 depend from claim 7 and are therefore allowable for the same reasons as claim 7. In addition, claim 8 requires that the step of adding 2- amino-2- methyl-1- propanol to the

chemical feeder. This step is not shown or suggested by the prior art, and claim 8 is submitted to patentably distinguish over the prior art for this reason as well.

Claim 9 requires the additional step of feeding the film-type corrosion inhibitor directly into the steam header based on an amount of evaporation in the boiler. This avoids the problem of overdosing the boiler system with more corrosion inhibitor than is needed. This aspect of the invention is not shown by the prior art, and claim 9 is submitted to be allowable over the prior art for this additional reason as well.

Claim 10 requires a boiler system comprising a boiler, a heat exchanger connected to the boiler by a steam line, a condensate line connected to the boiler, and a source of corrosion inhibitor connected to the steam line for introducing a quantity of corrosion inhibitor directly into the steam line.

The prior art does not show a boiler system having a source of corrosion inhibitor connected to a steam line for feeding a corrosion inhibitor directly into a steam line as required by claim 10. Claim 10 is submitted to be allowable over the prior art for this reason.

Claims 11-15 depend from claim 10 and are therefore allowable for the same reasons as claim 10. In addition, claim 11 further requires that the corrosion inhibitor be a film-type corrosion inhibitor. This aspect of the invention is not shown or suggested

by the prior art, and claim 11 is submitted to further distinguish over the prior art for this reason.

Claim 13 requires a chemical feeder connected to a steam line at a point near the point at which the steam line is connected to the boiler. This aspect of the invention is not shown or suggested by the prior art, and claim 13 is submitted to further distinguish over the prior art for this reason.

Claim 15 requires that the corrosion inhibitor comprise 2-amino-2-methyl-1-propanol. The use of this corrosion inhibitor as required by claim 15 is not shown or suggested by the prior art, and claim 15 is submitted to be further allowable over the prior art for this reason.

Claim 16 requires a method of feeding a corrosion inhibitor that involves providing a chemical feeder containing a corrosion inhibitor, connecting the chemical feeder to a steam line in a boiler system, and feeding the corrosion inhibitor directly into the steam line. Neither Nemes nor Harder shows a method of feeding a corrosion inhibitor directly into a steam line of a boiler system as required by claim 16, and claim 16 is submitted to be allowable over the prior art for this reason.

Claims 17-21 depend from claim 16 and are therefore allowable for the same reasons as claim 16. In addition, claim 17 requires that the chemical feeder be connected to the steam line at a point near the boiler. This is not shown or suggested by the prior art,

and claim 17 is submitted to further distinguish over the prior art for this reason.

Claims 18, 20 and 21 each require the use of a specific type of corrosion inhibitor. The use of the claimed corrosion inhibitors is not shown or suggested by the prior art, and these claims are submitted to further distinguish over the prior art for this reason.

Claim 19 further requires the step of feeding the corrosion inhibitor into the steam line based on an amount of evaporation in the boiler. This aspect of the invention is not shown or suggested by the prior art. Claim 19 is submitted to further distinguish over the prior art for this reason.

DRAWINGS

Identifying legends have been added to various portions of the drawings.

Conclusion

Each issue raised in the Office Action dated February 2, 2004, has been addressed, and it is submitted that claims 1 and 3-21 are in condition for allowance. Wherefore the examination and allowance of these claims is earnestly solicited.

Should there be any outstanding matters that need to be resolved in the present application, the Examiner is respectfully

requested to contact Scott T. Wakeman (Reg. No. 37,750) at the telephone number of the undersigned below, to conduct an interview in an effort to expedite prosecution in connection with the present application.

If necessary, the Commissioner is hereby authorized in this, concurrent, and future replies, to charge payment or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 02-2448 for any additional fees required under 37 C.F.R. §§ 1.16 or 1.17; particularly, extension of time fees.

Respectfully submitted,

BIRCH, STEWART, KOLASCH & BIRCH, LLP

By 

Michael K. Mutter, #29,680

P.O. Box 747

Falls Church, VA 22040-0747

(703) 205-8000

MKM/^{ad}STW/te/mlr